

Frazier, Robert A, deposition of 2/24/77 in C.A.75-226

*= possibly useful, ?= question, K= for King case

5 Examination of projectiles includes "whether or not they had been fired from any particular weapon."

* He begins with needless evasiveness, more obstructionism perhaps too.

* 11 In recounting procedures, the making and keeping of notes, he then states the Examiner "would dictate what we call a 'Laboratory Report', or a paragraph for a Laboratory report, to be included in some master report."
While there can be some fudging over what is a "master report," of which we have not one that could be so described, there is no question about "a paragraph for a Laboratory report." We have not been provided with a single such separate paragraph dictated by any agent. They might argue that in this case there was none but on the face that is not reasonable.

13-4 If tests were conducted for the Commission, "the report would go directly, as I recall, to the Warren Commission, and possibly then a copy made to be sent to our Dallas office."

* Whatever they call a "report," the Commission got none on NAAs. Only a meaningless interpretative letter.

These reports were filed "in a drawer in my office." The others merely kept their lab worksheets. 15 Normally they'd also keep a copy of the report.

15. "I would say that they kept a file copy downstairs." Meaning Communications Division.

K 17 "We received a bullet, we would make an examination just as soon as we were not doing something else more important."

18 Some lab work was delayed while they examined the limousine but only a matter of hours. This says that the lab people made that limousine examination.

* 18 "Did the examiners who conducted tests (spectro and NAA) make their reports available to you?" "Not necessarily." This is contrary to his WC testimony, that they gave all to him.

* 19-20 He says the reports were sent to Dallas for incorporation into investigative reports and thus forwarded to the Commission. This means there has to have been what Kilty did not swear to, a Dallas Field Office search.
Kilty also knows the procedure and he did not testify to this or such a search for what was sent to Dallas.

* 21 Claims not to recall if tests were made for human residues but the performance of such tests are possible, "it has been done for years." "I would think so" in response to were they done in JFK. We have no such report of any kind. They would be "To determine if there were blood or other body tissues present."

21 bottom. Beginning on 399, with his examination of it, in his hand.

* 22 Says testing for human residues "would have very little value as far as investigating" in this case, when there was no proof the bullet had been in any human body, and on 23, "if I recall, we didn't make any tests on this bullet for blood." He then says "It seems to me I call some testimony that the bullet was reasonably clean when we received it," as he should, he being the one who so testified.
Has "no idea" whether the wiping of the bullet was ever investigated.

✓ 26 Testifies the history attributed to 399 is "very reasonable" and "yes, it would be probable" that it would "be in the condition in which it now is."

28 The question if of bone leaving marks and he wants to get paid for expert testimony.

31 "I may have seen some X-rays." Not photos of autopsy.

32 Asked about the weight of the metal removed for testing he again demands expert fees!

33 Says he furnished all this material, including on weight, to me.

~~check~~ check to see if he gave me the weight. Can't be of the material removed. Not after removal of samples he says he did not remove. He even testifies. He finally admits a jacket sample had been removed. Evasive on whether he testified to removal of core sample and "you don't volunteer questions when you're not asked."

* 40 Gallager submitted "his report to me, and I prepared the formal report of the entire examination." Relating to 399, fragments and windshield. Do we have whatever could

be called "a formal report?" This is from his W.C. testimony.

46 Thinks there was NAA on windshield but does not know.

* 47 He made a curbstome report. We have only the handwritten notes.

* He recalls "stating that it had been struck by a bullet which was not a jacketed bullet in its original condition; it could have been a mutilated bullet or a lead bullet..." But on 48 "it could have been a wheelweight so far as I was concerned." Then why do a spectroscopic examination ks not to determine that it was a bullet and not a wheelweight?

49 When he examines the curbstome he says "I couldn't tell you now if that mark is these or isn't. I made a microscopic examination of it."

51 Examines record and says "these are not my original notes on either of these two - first two pages," but maybe some of the other language, "I may have dictated it; I don't know -" He identifies it as "the spectrographic worksheet." This is to say not the spectrographic report and it leaves missing any report or any microscopic examination.

54 "...there weren't any of the worksheets lost, I know that, because they were all there" He was still an agent and was in on compliance and did not provide any microscopic examination worksheet, from this testimony not even the record in the form in which that examination was requested.

Interestingly he says he first became aware that "someone was requesting the results of the spectrographic examination" in terms of years 11 or 12, before 1967. He says this was before FOIA. "I know that when Mr. Weisberg requested something, it was given to him." My first request received not even an acknowledgement.

* 60 Asked if the picture of the JFK collar shows overlapping holes he says "That shirt was examined by another examiner for that purpose." We have no such report.

61 Asked if the holes did not overlap could they have been caused by a bullet he responds, "You're asking for an opinion in a scientific matter, and you're prepared to pay expert witnesses fees, I'll answer -- any questions you like, but unless you do, I'm only going to testify to what I know." Yet he does know and he repeats the examination was made, "I had it examined by another examiner for that purpose." Thinks it was Stombaugh, Paul.

* 62 "Did it at agent make a report?" "Yes, he did." We don't have it.

63 Testifies that a bullet exiting through the center of the collar could even have missed the knot of the tie. Asked if it then could have struck Connally Ryan objects.

64 His reason for saying "I couldn't answer that question" is "because I don't know the position of the shirt was on the President's body at the time it occurred." This is asking for ridicule and disbelief.

Asked about a scalpel he first pretends no knowledge and then admits the tie "was cut off -- as I recall, it was cut off to the side."

* Because we have no such report should we use this as the basis for subpoenaing the tie and the pix of it for deposing Shaneyfelt and Gallagher? Stombaugh for his report? He probably say it was only verbal.

67 Although the picture clearly shows the tie was cut off right up against the knot he testifies while looking at the picture it is "not at the point where the tie is cut." Asked to "mark the point on it where the nick is" he refuses "unless you compensate me in the usual manner of Paying expert witness fees." And after some further discussion about fees he does not answer.

* 75 He says the curbstome sketch is not his. He testified to having made a microscopic examination himself and to spectrographic examination by Gallagher. There is nothing in spectroscopy to indicate direction. Either this is Frazier's sketch or there is another report missing.

76 He testified to hearsay to save Gallagher the time! But Gallagher was a witness, only not testifying to this.

His affogance and evasiveness are such that he raises questions about his intergity. The points at which he demands expert witness fees all succeeded in preventing answer that do address whether or not there should be other tests rests and reports wer have not received. Despite this he did testify to reports we do not have.